



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/538,224	11/07/2005	Ole-Bendt Rasmussen	50000-OR03	9368
23873	7590	06/09/2009	EXAMINER	
ROBERT W STROZIER, P.L.L.C			SIMONE, CATHERINE A	
PO BOX 429			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BELLAIRE, TX 77402-0429			1794	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/09/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/538,224	RASMUSSEN, OLE-BENDT	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Catherine Simone	1794	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 March 2009.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 100-140 and 173 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 140 and 173 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 100-139 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 09 June 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Election/Restrictions***

1. Applicant's election of Group I, claims 100-139, in the reply filed on 3/20/2009 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).
2. Claims 140 and 173 stand withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 3/20/2009.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
4. Claim 100-139 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
5. The term "generally" in claims 100, 106, 110, 121, 132 and 139 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "generally" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. Appropriate correction is required.

6. Regarding claim 131, the phrase "such as" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

7. Claims 120-123 recites the limitation "the first attenuated zones". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims. Appropriate correction is required.

8. The term "fibre-like" in claim 135 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "fibre-like" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. Appropriate correction is required.

9. A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. See MPEP § 2173.05(c). Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949). In the present instance, claim 102 recites the broad recitation "is no more than 4 mm", and the claim also recites "preferably no more than 3 mm", which is the

narrower statement of the range, and the claim further recites “still more preferably no more than 2 mm”, which is the narrowest statement of the range. Appropriate correction is required.

10. Claim 103 recites the broad recitation “on average at least 5%”, and the claim also recites “preferably at least 10% longer”, which is the narrower statement of the range. Appropriate correction is required.

11. Claim 105 recites the broad recitation “no less than 15%” and the claim also recites “preferably no less than 20%”, which is the narrower statement of the range, the claim further recites “still more preferably no less than 30%”, which is the narrowest statement of the range. Appropriate correction is required.

12. Claim 114 recites the broad recitation “no less than 30 MPa” and the claim also recites “preferably no less than 50 MPa”, which is the narrower statement of the range, the claim further recites “still more preferably no less than 75 MPa”, which is the narrowest statement of the range. Appropriate correction is required.

13. Claim 116 recites the broad recitation “the choice of material for B and of depth of A’s fluting is such that by stretching of the laminate perpendicular to the direction of A’s fluting up to the point where A’s waving has disappeared, B still has not undergone any significant plastic deformation” and the claim also recites “preferably B comprises a thermoplastic elastomer”, which is the narrower statement of the limitation. Appropriate correction is required.

14. Claim 120 recites the broad recitation “more than half of” and the claim also recites “preferably no less than 70% of the width”, which is the narrower statement of the range. Appropriate correction is required.

Art Unit: 1794

15. Claim 123 recites the broad recitation “less than 75%” and the claim also recites “preferably less than 50%”, which is the narrower statement of the range, the claim further recites “more preferably less than 30%”, which is the narrowest statement of the range. Appropriate correction is required.

16. Claim 124 recites the broad recitation “consist of material which is orientable at room temperature” and the claim also recites “preferably they mainly consist of polyolefin”, which is the narrower statement of the limitation. Appropriate correction is required.

17. Claim 127 recites the broad recitation “one or both plies are flattened at intervals” and the claim also recites “preferably bonded across each ones entire width at the flattened locations”, which is the narrower statement of the limitation. Appropriate correction is required.

18. Claim 129 recites the broad recitation “no less than 700 MPa” and the claim also recites “preferably no less than 1000 MPa”, which is the narrower statement of the range. Appropriate correction is required.

19. Claim 131 recites the broad recitation “said material is a preservative” and the claim also recites “preferably an oxygen scavenger or ethylene scavenger, a biocide, such as a fungicide or bactericide, a corrosion inhibitor or a fire extinguishing agent”, which is the narrower statement of the limitation. Appropriate correction is required.

20. Claim 136 recites the broad recitation “used as a sanitary backsheet” and the claim also recites “preferably on a diaper or as a sheet for covering a patient during surgery”, which is the narrower statement of the range. Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

21. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

22. Claims 100-105, 110, 111, 121, 122, 127, 128 and 130-138 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Clark (US 4,588,631).

23. Regarding claim 100, Clark discloses a laminate comprising a monofilm-formed ply A (Fig. 3, one of corrugated sheets 15), and another monofilm-formed ply B (Fig. 3, another one of corrugated sheets 15), both mainly comprising orientable thermoplastic polymer material (col. 4, lines 46-53), in which ply A (Fig. 3, one of sheets 15) has a fluted (corrugated) configuration and ply B (Fig. 3, another one of sheets 15) on a first side is adhesive bonded in bonding zones to the crests on a first side of A (Fig. 3; col. 5, lines 5-30), where ply B also has a fluted (corrugated) configuration (Fig. 3, sheet 15), the flute direction of ply B is forming an angle of 90° to the flute direction of ply A (Fig. 3, sheets 15) and the bonding zones are on the crests of the first side of ply B to produce spot bonding with the crests on the first side of ply A (Fig. 3, sheets 15; col. 5, lines 8-30), the adhesive bonding is directly ply A to ply B (Fig. 3, sheets 15) and is established through a lamination layer on either ply A or ply B (col. 5, lines 11-25), and the wavelengths of the flutes in ply A and/ or ply B are deemed no longer than 5 mm, and the wavelengths of the flutes in both A and B are deemed less than 10 mm (col. 8, lines 51-53), since the peak-to-peak distance of the waves of the corrugated sheet is 0.0476 inches (1.2 mm).

24. Regarding claim 101, Clark discloses the thickness of each of the plies being generally the same in bonded and unbonded zones (Fig. 3, sheets 15 and Fig. 1, t<sub>2</sub> and col. 9, lines 65-68).

25. Regarding claim 102, Clark discloses the flute wavelength in each of the two plies being no more than 4 mm, since the peak-to-peak distance of the waves of the corrugated sheet is 0.0476 inches (1.2 mm) (col. 8, lines 51-53).

26. Regarding claims 103 and 104, in Fig. 3 of Clark, it is deemed to show that each of the two plies (15) has a flute with a curved length on average of at least 5%, preferably at least 10% longer, and of at least 15% longer than the linear wavelength (also see Fig. 1).

27. Regarding claim 105, the width of each bonding zone (tips of the crests of the waves in Figs. 1 and 3) is deemed to be no less than 15%, preferably no less than 20%, and still more preferably no less than 30% of the flute wavelength.

28. Regarding claim 110, the main direction in which the flutes of ply A extend is substantially perpendicular to the main direction in which the flutes of ply B extend (Fig. 3, sheets 15).

29. Regarding claim 111, one of the two directions of the flutes essentially coincide with the machine direction of the lamination (Fig. 3 and col. 8, lines 34-40).

30. Regarding claim 121, the tips of the crests of the flutes in Figs. 1 and 3 are deemed first attenuated zones and are deemed coincident with the bonding zones (the tips of the crests of the flutes in Figs. 1 and 3).

31. Regarding claim 122, the first attenuated zones are present at least in one of the two plies (Fig. 3, tips of crests of the flutes), characterized by a second solid-state-attenuated zone between each pair of adjacent first attenuated zones, the second attenuated zones being narrower than the

first attenuated zones and located on the non-bonded crests of the respective ply (see Figs. 1 and 3).

32. Regarding claims 127 and 128, note at least some of the flutes in both plies are flattened at intervals and preferably bonded across each ones entire width at the flattened locations to make the two arrays of flutes form closed pockets (Figs. 1 and 3), and the flattened portions are all of the flutes in array (Figs. 1 and 3).

33. Regarding claims 130 and 131, note at least some of the channels formed by the flutes in plies A and B contain a filling material in liquid form which is a preservative (effluent; col. 6, lines 8-10).

34. Regarding claim 132, note both A and B are supplied with a multitude of perforations, whereby the perforations do not reach into the bonded spots, and the perforations in A are displaced from the perforations in B so as to cause gas or liquid when passing through the laminate, to run a distance through the flutes parallel to the main surfaces of the laminate (openings; col. 4, lines 4-7).

35. Regarding claim 133, the channels contain filling material (effluent; col. 6, lines 8-10).

36. Regarding claim 134, the limitation is a functional limitation and is deemed to be an inherent characteristic of the prior art, since Clark discloses a laminate having the same structure as the claimed laminate (see above). MPEP 2114 and 2173.05(g).

37. Regarding claim 135, note a nap of fiber-like film portions protruding from the borders of the perforations of at least one surface of the laminate (col. 7, lines 63-66).

38. Regarding claims 136-138, the limitations “used as a sanitary backsheet”, “used for insulation of buildings”, and “used as a geotextile” are recitations of the intended use of the

claimed invention. A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. MPEP 2111.02 (II) and 2114. As shown above, Clark teaches the same structure of the claimed laminate. Therefore, the laminate of Clark is capable of performing the intended use as claimed.

39. Claims 100, 102, 107, 110-126, 129 and 139 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rasmussen (US 5,626,944).

40. Regarding claim 100, Rasmussen discloses a laminate comprising a multifilm-formed ply A, and another multifilm-formed ply B (col. 6, lines 55-65), both mainly comprising orientable thermoplastic polymer material (col. 16, lines 40-50), in which ply A has a fluted (ribbed) configuration (col. 5, lines 53-57) and ply B on a first side is adhesive bonded in bonding zones to the crests on a first side of A (col. 6, lines 18-33 and lines 55-65), where ply B also has a fluted (ribbed) configuration (col. 5, lines 53-57), the flute direction of ply B is deemed to form an angle of 90° to the flute direction of ply A, since a cross-laminate is being formed (see abstract), and the bonding zones are on the crests of the first side of ply B to produce spot bonding with the crests on the first side of ply A (col. 6, lines 18-33), the adhesive bonding is directly ply A to ply B and is established through a lamination layer on either ply A or ply B (col. 6, lines 55-65), and the wavelengths of the flutes in ply A and/ or ply B are no longer than 5 mm, and the wavelengths of the flutes in both A and B are less than 10 mm (col. 4, lines 35-37).

41. Regarding claim 102, Rasmussen discloses the flute wavelength in each of the two plies being no more than 4 mm, preferably no more than 3 mm and still more preferably no more than 2 mm (col. 4, lines 35-37).
42. Regarding claim 107, the flutes are curved or zig-zagging along one direction (claim 10).
43. Regarding claim 110, the main direction in which the flutes of ply A extend is substantially perpendicular to the main direction in which the flutes of ply B extend, since a cross-laminate is being formed (claim 1).
44. Regarding claim 111, one of the two directions of the flutes essentially coincide with the machine direction of the lamination (see abstract).
45. Regarding claim 112, ply A is molecularly oriented mainly in a direction parallel to the direction of its flutes or in a direction close to the latter as determined by shrinkage tests (claim 1).
46. Regarding claim 113, ply B is also molecularly oriented (claim 1).
47. Regarding claim 114, the limitation is deemed a latent property of the prior art, since the composition and/or structure of the laminate in Rasmussen is substantially identical to that of the claimed laminate. It has been held that mere recognition of latent properties in the prior art does not render nonobvious an otherwise known invention. MPEP 2145 (II).
48. Regarding claim 115, ply B inherently has a lower coefficient of elasticity than A, both as measured in the direction perpendicular to the flute direction of A, since the laminate in Rasmussen has substantially the same composition and/or structure as that of the claimed laminate.
49. Regarding claim 116, ply B is a thermoplastic elastomer (col. 6, lines 55-65).

50. Regarding claim 117, ply B is molecularly oriented mainly in a direction parallel to the direction of its flutes or in a direction close to the latter as determined by shrinkage tests (claim 1).

51. Regarding claim 118, ply A is composed of several films, and the main direction of molecular orientation, is the resultant of different monoaxial or biaxial orientations in the films optionally mutually differently directed (claims 1 and 9).

52. Regarding claim 119, ply B is composed of several films, and the main direction of molecular orientation, is the resultant of different monoaxial or biaxial orientations in the films optionally mutually differently directed (claims 1 and 9).

53. Regarding claim 120, the first attenuated zones are present in at least one of the two plies wherein if such zones of attenuated ply extend in their transverse direction beyond the corresponding zones of bonding into non-bonded zones of the ply, the extensions within each non-bonded zone are limited to a total width which leaves more than half of and preferably no less than 70% of the width of the non-bonded zone as not belonging to any first attenuated zone, these widths being the distance measured along the curved surfaces (see Figure 1).

54. Regarding claim 121, the first attenuated zones are present in at least one of the plies and in which the bonding zones are generally coincident with the first attenuated zones (Figs. 1 and 4).

55. Regarding claim 122, the first attenuated zones are present at least in one of the two plies, characterized by a second solid-state-attenuated zone between each pair of adjacent first attenuated zones, the second attenuated zones being narrower than the first attenuated zones and located on the non-bonded crests of the respective ply (Fig. 4).

56. Regarding claim 123, note at least one of the two plies exhibits solid-state-attenuated zones wherein the first attenuated zones of the ply are attenuated so that the minimum-thickness in such zone is less than 75% of the maximum thickness of the ply in the non-bonded zone (Figs. 1 and 4).

57. Regarding claim 124, plies A and B consist of polyolefin (claim 9).

58. Regarding claim 125, the spot-bonding between plies A and B is effected through a lower melting surface layer on at least one of the plies, formed in a coextrusion process (col. 6, lines 55-65).

59. Regarding claim 126, note at least one of the plies comprises a barrier film designed for protection against oxygen and other gaseous materials (col. 6, lines 55-65).

60. Regarding claim 129, the coefficient of elasticity E in at least one of the plies, measured in the unbonded zone of the ply in the direction parallel to the flute (rib), as an average over the unbonded zone is inherently no less than 700 MPa and no less than 1000 MPa, since the laminate in Rasmussen has substantially the same composition and/or structure as that of the claimed laminate.

61. Regarding claim 139, Rasmussen discloses a bag made from the laminate wherein the flutes on one of the two major surfaces of the bag are perpendicular to the flutes on the other major surface of the bag (col. 1, lines 26-29 and col. 5, lines 65-66).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

62. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

63. Claims 106-108 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clark (US 4,588,631).

64. Clark discloses the claimed laminate as described above except for the flutes extending in a generally rectilinear shape, being curved or zig-zagging and/or branched, and being differently shaped in a pattern which gives a visual effect showing a name, text, logo or similar. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to change the shape of the flutes in Clark to be in a rectilinear shape, be curved or zig-zagging and/or branched, and be differently shaped in a pattern which gives a visual effect showing a name, text, logo or similar, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the shape of the flutes. A change in shape is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art, absent unexpected results. MPEP 2144.04 (IV). One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to change the shape of the flutes in Clark to be rectilinear in shape, be curved or zig-zagging and/or branched, and be differently shaped in a pattern which gives a visual effect showing a name, text, logo or similar in order to change the visual appearance of the laminate. It is desirable to change the visual appearance of the laminate in Clark in order to make the laminate more appealing to the consumer.

65. Claim 109 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clark (US 4,588,631).

66. Clark discloses the claimed laminate as described above except for the plies having different colors. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to change the color of the

plies in Clark to be of different colors, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the aesthetics of the plies. A change in the aesthetics is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art, absent unexpected results. MPEP 2144.04 (I). One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to change the color of the plies in Clark to be differently colored in order to change the visual attractiveness of the laminate. It is desirable to change the visual attractiveness of the laminate in Clark in order to make the laminate more appealing to the consumer.

67. Claims 106 and 108 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rasmussen (US 5,626,944).

68. Rasmussen discloses the claimed laminate as described above except for the flutes extending in a generally rectilinear shape and being differently shaped in a pattern which gives a visual effect showing a name, text, logo or similar. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to change the shape of the flutes (ribs) in Rasmussen to be in a rectilinear shape and be differently shaped in a pattern which gives a visual effect showing a name, text, logo or similar, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the shape of the flutes. A change in shape is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art, absent unexpected results. MPEP 2144.04 (IV). One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to change the shape of the flutes (ribs) in Rasmussen to be rectilinear in shape and be differently shaped in a pattern which gives a visual effect showing a name, text, logo or similar in order to change the visual appearance of the laminate. It is desirable to change the visual appearance of the laminate in Rasmussen in order to make the laminate more appealing to the consumer.

69. Claim 109 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rasmussen (US 5,626,944).

70. Rasmussen discloses the claimed laminate as described above except for the plies having different colors. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to change the color of the plies in Rasmussen to be of different colors, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the aesthetics of the plies. A change in the aesthetics is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art, absent unexpected results. MPEP 2144.04 (I). One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to change the color of the plies in Rasmussen to be differently colored in order to change the visual attractiveness of the laminate. It is desirable to change the visual attractiveness of the laminate in Rasmussen in order to make the laminate more appealing to the consumer.

### ***Conclusion***

71. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The U.S. 3,649,431 patent is cited for further teachings of a laminate similar to that instantly disclosed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Catherine Simone whose telephone number is (571) 272-1501. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:30-6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Sample can be reached on (571) 272-1376. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/CAS/  
Catherine A. Simone  
Examiner, Art Unit 1794  
June 7, 2009

/Alicia Chevalier/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794